

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment Dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-28 remain in this application for further review. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 are amended as set forth above. Claims 3-4, 14-19, and 21 have been previously presented and claims 2, 5-7, 9-12, and 22-28 are original. No new matter has been added.

I. Request for Formal Interview

This application was filed on April 27, 2001 with a priority date of February 16, 2001. A Request for Continued Examination was filed on April 26, 2005. The Office Action referenced herein is in response to the filed RCE. If after review of this Response Examiner Henning still finds that the claims are not allowable over the cited references, applicants respectfully request a formal interview with Examiner Henning to address any outstanding issues regarding the claims.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-28 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,484 issued to Rogers et al. ("Rogers") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,139 issued to Win et al. ("Win"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action. There is no suggestion in either of the references that they may be combined in the manner suggested. Furthermore, even if the above references could be combined for argument sake, they still fail to teach all the limitations of the claims. Even though applicants disagree with the rejection, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 as set forth above to further clarify this matter and expedite allowance of the claims. Neither Rogers nor Win teach or otherwise suggest the combination of elements set forth in the claims. Applicants' amended claim 1

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment Dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

specifically recites the following combination of elements that are not taught or suggested by the references:

"identifying the source of the received message from data associated with the received message"

"associating a security role with the received message based on the identified source of the received message"

"inserting an identifier into the received message to identify the associated security role"

"comparing the associated security role of the received message with a security privilege associated with the at least one configuration setting on the mobile device"

Applicants' amended claim 8 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or suggested by the references:

"a router configured to receive a configuration message over a wireless communication link, the router being further configured to identify a source of the configuration message and insert a security role identifier into the received configuration message based on the identified source, the router being further configured to pass the configuration message to other components of the mobile device, the configuration message including an instruction that affects a configuration setting"

Applicants' amended claim 13 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or suggested by the references:

"receiving a configuration message including a header and an instruction associated with a configuration setting stored on the mobile device"

"identifying the source of the received message from the header of the received configuration message"

"associating a security role with the instruction based on the source of the received message, wherein the associated security role is associated to the instruction by a tag included in the message"

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment Dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

Applicants' amended claim 20 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or suggested by the references:

"a second field including a security role identifier; wherein the security role identifier is configured for association with a configuration message"

"a third field including a security role associated with the configuration service provider, wherein, the security role of the configuration service provider identifies a provider privilege which must be had in order to make use of the configuration service provider, and wherein the third field is configured to determine when the security role identifier matches the security role of the configuration service provider"

When the aforementioned elements of independent claims 1, 8, 13 and 20 are read in light of the claims in its entirety, the elements of those claims are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. Rogers teaches as follows:

"A wireless communication device with SMS capabilities can be remotely configured by sending specifically configured SMS messages. A manufacturer can configure a wireless device to have control over certain features accessible through SMS messages. A configuring SMS message is constructed using a specific format to inform the wireless device of the presence of a feature control message. Predetermined combinations of characters unlikely to occur in normal messages are used as message start and stop delimiters. A series of fields are defined in the SMS message with the fields separated by delimiters distinct from the message start and stop delimiters. Commands may be sent to the wireless device using point-to-point as well as broadcast SMS messages. The wireless device receives the SMS message and identifies it as a feature control command by noting the presence of a message start delimiter. The message is then parsed according to the field delimiters within the message. The wireless device then configures software and hardware features according to the contents of the SMS message fields." Rogers, at Abstract.

The Office Action admits that Rogers "fails to disclose associating a security role with the received message based on the identified source of the received message; comparing the associated security role of the received message with a security privilege associated with the at least one configuration setting on the mobile device; and if the associated security role of the

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment Dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

received message is in agreement with the security privilege associated with the at least one configuration setting on the mobile device, processing the request associated with the configuration information." The Office Action propounds that Win teaches what Rogers lacks. However, contrary to this assertion, Win pertains to user authentication and does not pertain to a configuration message or the routing thereof. As cited in the Office Action, Win teaches as follows:

"When the user selects a resource, the browser sends an open URL request and cookie to a Protected Web Server. A Protected Web Server is a web server with resources protected by the Runtime Module. The Runtime Module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource to return information that is customized based on the user's name and roles." *Win*, col. 6, lines 36-44.

For example, along with several other elements highlighted above in the claims, the proposed combination fails to teach or otherwise suggest:

1. "inserting an identifier into the received message to identify the associated security role" as recited in claim 1;
2. "the router being further configured to identify a source of the configuration message and insert a security role identifier into the received configuration message based on the identified source " as recited in claim 8;
3. "associating a security role with the instruction based on the source of the received message, wherein the associated security role is associated to the instruction by a tag included in the message " as recited in claim 13; and
4. "a second field including a security role identifier; wherein the security role identifier is configured for association with a configuration message; a third field including a security role associated with the configuration

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment Dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

service provider, wherein, the security role of the configuration service provider identifies a provider privilege which must be had in order to make use of the configuration service provider, and wherein the third field is configured to determine when the security role identifier matches the security role of the configuration service provider" as recited in claim 20.

Accordingly, applicants assert that independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 are allowable over the cited references. Regarding the dependent claims, claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-19 and 21-28 include elements not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references. Also, claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-19 and 21-28 ultimately depend from independent claims 8, 13, and 20, respectively. Claims 8, 13, and 20 are thought allowable as stated above. Accordingly, applicants believe that claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-19 and 21-28 are allowable for at least those same reasons.

III. Request For Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

App. No. 09/843,901
Amendment Dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ryan T. Grace". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Ryan T. Grace
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200